

In Texas we coordinate...first come, first served...period.

We space 85 miles co-channel and seldom swerve from that unless there is a special, documented and agreed by all parties reason.

If all the freqs in a certain area are gone....then they are gone.

Its like buying land. If its all gone you can't make any more. It is gone...zip...not here...and in some cases at any price.

I do not want to see the selling or cordinations from one trsuttee to another. This has occured in Texas and we have polices that prevent the transfer of cordinations from one indivual to another.

Not everyone can have a cordination on 146.94 in downtown Dallas. There is already on there and that freq is GONE.

That is how tell them. Nicely, but there are other bands to put radios on.

I encourage wanna bees to get involved with a club or repeater group that is unstaffed or whatever.

This is how we solve the question of who is "fit" to have a repeater.

Is is the simple matter as my Great-Great-Great Grandfather CSA General Nathaniel Bedford Forest said in the Civil War....

Its who gets there the firstist wh the mostist.

Paul,ZW

```
{ Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW      | Do Not Be Afraid Of Any Man      }
{ Huntsville, Texas 77340 | No Matter What His Size          }
{ 409-291-9532            | Just Call On Me In Time Of Need. }
{ vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu    | And I Will Equalize! .....Samuel Colt, 1838 }
```

Date: Tue, 3 Oct 1995 23:50:28 -0500 (CDT)
 From: Paul Gilbert <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu>
 To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
 Subject: The "Ham Press" and more

In answer to the folks on the list that feel there are smoke, mirrors and hidden agendas...

I do not have one and do not know of anyone that does...except the possible one that I put forth a few weeks ago about some folks wanting and planing on us to disagree and the FCC giving up on us (the coordinators) and telling someone they are NOW the SPOC and will not talk to anyone else.

Maybe I am seeing ghosts, but it is possible. Remember the oldest tactic in warfare...divide and conquer.

Once we find out what the FCC wants of us, if aything really, then we can begin to work out plans.

As to agendas....

Do we want to follow the one that the ARRL has sent out????

I would say maybe in a step by step form. VERY SLOWLY and CAREFULLY!!!

The first parts I have no real problems with, Hallers address and discussion on SPOC.

I do not think we need or will get far enough to do committee work. I would feel uneasy about committing Texas to something that would impact coordination for the next 20-30 years without consulting my board or membership.

If votes and "decisions" are made that is what we would be doing.

We are ALL fixin to walk into a mine field of which we have no map and only a very cheap metal detector.

BE VERY VERY CAREFUL. Hasty made comments and decisions will bite us for years to come.

The kling-ons and Romulans are un-cloaking.

Paul, ZW

```
{ Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW      | Do Not Be Afraid Of Any Man      }
{ Huntsville, Texas 77340 | No Matter What His Size          }
{ 409-291-9532            | Just Call On Me In Time Of Need. }
{ vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu    | And I Will Equalize! .....Samuel Colt, 1838 }
```

Date: Wed, 4 Oct 1995 22:31:27 -0500 (CDT)
 From: Paul Gilbert <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu>
 To: MENDELS <MENDELS@CCABC.COM>
 Cc: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
 Subject: Re: More News Hounds?

```
{ Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW      | Do Not Be Afraid Of Any Man      }
{ Huntsville, Texas 77340 | No Matter What His Size          }
{ 409-291-9532            | Just Call On Me In Time Of Need. }
{ vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu    | And I Will Equalize! .....Samuel Colt, 1838 }
```

On Wed, 4 Oct 1995, MENDELS wrote:

```
>
> First we have an invasion of the yellow press in the form of Westlink and
> possibly others.
>
> We vote to bar the press, but find that it is a public meeting and that we
> can't
> bar them.
>
```

Where does it say this is a public meeting????? In Texas at least it would not be. If this meeting was in Texas we could close the meeting to whom ever we wanted.

If this is a public meeting then Dick's MACC Board Meeting is also unless he is talking about litigation or personal matters.

We can close the meeting to the invited attendees and their designees anytime we want to...unless MO. law is reverse of Texas law.

We are not an organization...yet and not one that falls under open meetings acts...unless I am wrong. If I am I want to see it in writing.

Steve, I hate to disagree with you. But I still feel this should be only

coordinators or there disagnees for the first one.

With the "press" there many will not talk as freely as they would in fear they will be mis-quoted.

Paul, ZW

From: "Paul Gilbert" <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu >
To: coordinator@cs.tamu.edu, rwf <rwf@mindspring.com >
Date: Tue, 27 Feb 1996 07:45:26 +0000
Subject: Re: Definition of SPOC?

> Paul Gilbert wrote:
>
> >The way I saw it at St. Louis was this was for REPEATER coordinators.
> < snip >
> >However, I have no problem with including other modes if they have
> >their act together. Most packets groups do not. Most ATV groups do
> >not. If they (the non-repeater groups) have it toether then they
> >should be included.
>
> Paul-
>
> Glad to see that you are in favor of including other modes.
>
> ATV includes repeaters... repeaters that in much of the Southeast *are*
> included in band plans and coordinated by the same recognized coordinators
> that coordinate FM voice repeaters. This is the case within SERA. I'm not
> aware of a whole lot of other areas whose coordinators recognize ATV and its
> unique requirements and have accommodated it in their band plans.
>
> Our State frequency coordinators have been educated on the technical
> requirements and characteristics of ATV and they coordinate ATV repeaters in
> much the same way as they would any other repeater. They aren't experts,
> but they ask for and receive technical input from me and other sources and
> they act based on this input along wish their experience with coordination
> repeaters of other modes.
>
> Because they are legitimately coordinated repeater systems, ATV repeaters
> deserve no less than equal treatment with FM voice systems. We must make
> sure to include this mode with its coordinated systems in whatever plans are
> made !

Texas does have a few coordinated ATV systems and a few that aren't.
The biggest problem in Texas is that we have ALOT!!! of 420 mhz
linking. Fortuanly, nearly all ATV ops and the 420 suff co-exist
fairly well except for one system that is in SE Texas. Even that
problem is better but the system is currently un-coordinated.

I asked the trustee of the Dallas ATV system to write me up standards
of constuction for an ATV system. It has equipment, tech and
operation specs in it. It is very well done.

We basicly in Texas use 421.250 or the 426.250 or 427.250. We use
434.00 for some inputs...but we don't encourage that. I try o
encouarge ATV activitiy in 1.2, 900, 2.4. Some have moved there.

We are in the process of planning our 1.2 gig band-plan. We have
allocated quite a bit of space for ATV there. 2 AM channels and 1 FM
channel.

Later..Paul,ZW

Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW
Huntsville, Texas
409-291-9532

The Texas VHF-FM Society
The Amateur Radio Repeater Coordinating
Agency for the Empire of Texas

Coordinating over 1500 Repeaters in Texas for the past 30 Years

Date: Tue, 27 Feb 1996 08:43:07 -0600
To: "Paul Gilbert" <vis_pfg@pip.shsu.edu>, coordinator@cs.tamu.edu
From: sgranth@felix.TECLink.Net (Steve Grantham)
Subject: Re: NFCC Digital/ATV Recognition

At 08:08 AM 2/27/96 +0000, Paul Gilbert wrote:

>Steve....

>

>With all due respect to your efforts on including the ATV, digital
>communities.....

>

>I believe that singeling (sp) them out in the manner that you have
>outlined is patch work at best.

(snip)

>This may sound a bit cold, but we are going to have a big enough job
>as it is and don't need to compound it with a bunch of wanna-bees.

>

>Later...Paul,ZW

>

>Paul Gilbert, KE5ZW
>Huntsville, Texas
>409-291-9532

The Texas VHF-FM Society
The Amateur Radio Repeater Coordinating
Agency for the Empire of Texas

>

>Coordinating over 1500 Repeaters in Texas for the past 30 Years

>

One footnote may be appropriate here... While the Texas VHF-FM Society may have been formed 30 some-odd years ago, it is a very different organization today. In fact, I believe it is fair to say it is a different organization today than it was just 3 years ago. There were not 1500 repeaters in Texas 30 years ago. KE5ZW stated at the Missouri meeting that he joined the Texas VHF-FM Society in 1985.

There are many things that have been handled correctly at the Texas VHF-FM Society over the years, and I would give credit where credit is due. In the past few years, however, I fear there has been a political drift away from the kind of level playing field where everyone is treated courteously and impartially.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The ARRL should print any proposal which it may seriously consider in QST, and ask the members to comment to the Officers and Directors.
2. The ARRL should resolve its own communications problems, so we do not become a "tail wagging the dog" society, or operate in a "political vacuum."
3. ARRL members who oppose an agreement with NFCC, Inc. should be able to have routine communication with the League's General Counsel's office without simultaneously communicating with the General Counsel of NFCC, Inc.
4. ARRL members should begin discussions on plans for a regulatory scheme to adopt the comments of the FCC's Ralph Haller, the reported observations of U. S. Senator Phil Gramm, and the rights of local coordination councils. (I have been contemplating such a plan. Stay tuned.)
5. The ARRL should hold the organizations it recognizes to reasonable standards - like it does with businesses who want to advertise in QST. I believe that if any of them offered a device for sale purporting to reduce the rights of amateurs to fully use their licenses, the advertising should or would be rejected.
6. Before the ARRL affiliates with any local coordinator, it should assure adoption of reasonable standards. The ARRL should assure its members that it affiliates only with coordinators that fully recognize all the rights and privileges provided to Amateur licensees by the FCC. This means arrangements to coordinate ATV, and all other repeater and auxiliary modes prescribed for each band in the FCC Rules.
7. Before endorsing or affiliating with any coordinator, there should be an audit of the coordinator's policies and procedures. The ARRL tests products for reviews in QST. Let's do the same for coordinators who wish to affiliate with us.

Other comments:

Subject: The League is attempting to act under cover of
darkness, AGAIN!
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 1996 11:21:07 -0400
From: NZ2T@aol.com
To: tom.blackwell@why.net
CC: dsumner@arrrl.org, wa2dhf@arrrl.org,
n5tc@arrrl.org, ka5tto@texoma.net

If this agreement is implemented without allowing full comment from our members, I will not "drop" the league, but what I will do is spend a lot of money in assisting the ouster of any director or vice-director who supports it.

From reading what I was sent, if it is complete, it lacks a lot of meat that it would need to provide sufficient protection from those who have but one thing in mind; control of our spectrum for their own selfish needs. In my experience with TSARC and the VHF Society, there have been TOO MANY occasions where coordinators have been PROVEN to be either prejudiced or incompetent. The only way I can see to stop this is to take coordination away from those who have a self-interest in spectrum management assignments.

Members of the BOD of the ARRL can not hold office if they have such a conflict. Why would the ARRL approach this any differently? Seems to me that perhaps the ARRL Field Organization might do better at all this, since we have no interest directly in spectrum issues. Even better would be designated representatives from various organizations, with a maximum of two (2) members from any one group. Perhaps there are other scenarios of similar makeup to a 'non-partisan', and fair way of coordinating our spectrum.

I think it would be EXTREMELY unwise of the ARRL to implement this agreement, without very careful consideration and additional member input. I would especially caution our incoming director and vice-director to consider how they vote. Whatever "the truth" is, I will see to it that "the truth" gets told to our membership in this section.

The document I see is not well thought out, and has far too many holes in it. It also gives the impression of "endorsement", which is something that many of us would not find prudent or appropriate. As an example, the ARRL BOD has no knowledge of ongoing investigations, which include some prominent members of one coordinating body. They also have no idea of local problems, which may be inflamed by such an agreement. In short, they are messing with a very unpredictable and inconsistent "tiger", which they may well have "by the tail" shortly.

No one has any problems with League agreements of cooperation with serving agencies, such as Red Cross, REACT, National Weather Service, Salvation Army, etc. The BOD of the ARRL has no business getting involved in matters which should be left to local folks to settle. That would be my advise, had I run and won the open Director's seat. It is ironic that I could not do so, because I have a professional conflict of interest, which rendered me ineligible to run.

Please keep me advised on this. I want to make sure that we know how our officials vote, so I can make it public wherever I go for the next two years (whether I am re-elected or not). I hope the vote is taken after Jan 1, but I doubt it. Maybe we can get Haynie to go on record, but he's probably too smart for that. Talk to you soon.

73 Bob

Subject: The League is attempting to act under cover of
darkness, AGAIN!
Date: Mon, 7 Oct 1996 11:21:09 -0400
From: NZ2T@aol.com
To: tom.blackwell@why.net
CC: n5tc@arrl.org

Oh...NFCC as the SPOC is

U N A C C E P T A B L E
!!
!!

It is similar to making CBS the coordinator for TV shows on all networks. There is a conflict of interest in allowing self-interested parties to control public property. In case some folks have forgotten, all licensees share amateur radio frequencies on a shared basis. We, "the people" have not been asked if all of this is okay with US, and therefore the democratic process is being bypassed on this very important issue.

Frankly, this is far too much power and authority being granted to some UNELECTED people. They may be elected by NFCC members, but not by us - and this is OUR spectrum. NFCC is not recognized by the VAST majority of us, and therefore they have no authority over my license or anyone else's. My license is issued by the FCC, not some ego-centric bozo, sitting by a computer somewhere trying to serve a limited interest.

We all know the kind of people who get involved in this stuff, since we see the results of "their work" in our OO investigations here. These are, to some extent, the same guys who willfully use their positions to favor friends and punish those who disagree with their dictatorial policies. What is really unfortunate is that most of the membership of these organizations are good people who mean well, but it seems like those we get into leadership roles many times turn out to be ill mannered trouble makers.

Well, for what it is worth, I sure hope they re-consider all of this. Frankly, I would rather not have to answer all of the mail and calls I know I will get. Problem for me is that they call me -

not the person they need to call. When Tom leaves office though, I am going to tell everyone:

Call Haynie! And I understand Jim prefers to be called after 2 AM!

Har and 73 Bob

Subject: Adjacent state cooperation???

Date: Wed, 09 Oct 1996 16:27:44 -0500

From: Brian Bell <n9xdw@surf-ic1.com>

To: rpt@pwrtc.com

Here we go again. More of the same. "

ONLY RECOGNIZED COORDINATION ENTITIES.....

" Who the heck is the "recognizer" anyway?

Aren't these bozo's working for us, the Amateurs, the "little guys", the ones who have sweated and toiled over our repeaters and spent our own hard earned cash on keeping them afloat in a lot of cases??? It's just this type of boneheadedness that has people in Indiana switching from the IRC to MiSMA for their coordination needs.

Sorry everyone, I just had to vent and this seemed like a good place to do it although I can think of a couple or three other places that about 105 of us ought to vent!!!

Forgive the tirade but, GEEZ!!! Where the heck has the TRUE spirit of Amateur radiomanship gone?

Comments of John, WA5WXA, 5-19-96, on the 1st proposal:

This proposal may have been generated in the best of faith to try and resolve problems that have arisen from incidents over actual or imaginary boundaries or conflicts of frequency usage, but it does not read as though there was anywhere near as much thought put into it as there should have been. The area that is most obviously non-existent is the complete and total lack of recognized input from the general Amateur community. This would lead one to suspect that this proposal is a 'legalized' method to allow special interest groups to have complete control of the Amateur spectrum. Without an avenue for the general Amateur community to address the policies, procedures, and standards of the NFOC/NFCC, and to have the ability to participate, this will be only an extension of the present conditions.

Also missing is any interaction with the

general Amateur community. No state, district, or regional meetings are mentioned. Is this to be another 'you don't need to know what we're doing' group?

This proposal, at best, is for a black-hole for the ARRL to dump money into and get nothing more than a duplication of efforts in return. The responsibilities indicated in the proposal for the NFCO is nothing more than another newsletter outlet. The objectives listed are nothing more than a secretarial position.

Since the ARRL, by signing this proposal, is going to finance the 'whole enchilada', why don't they hire another secretary and use the existing 'office space, etc.'? That would be a great amount of saved dollars.

It is very interesting that in M178 through M183 is included in the proposal. Could it be that actions of the NFCO/NFCC could lead to legal action? Is this deja-vu? If changing a US Code is part of the proposal, there might be a bit of anticipation in this effort. Could it be that this HAS to be a part of the effort in order for the ARRL to participate? Could it be that the ARRL has read the hand-writing on the wall? Or is it that this proposal is just a bit 'shaky'? If there is this much concern over a US Law, especially in the area of civil and/or criminal law, seems to me we ought to take a beer break and think this over. And, by the way:

» Are the 'delegates' going to be chosen/assigned/picked by state? Or by Amateur population?

» And who chooses/assigns/picks this delegate?

» If there is more than one 'recognized coordinating effort, does each group get a delegate position? . What would prohibit two or three hundred new 'coordinating groups' from popping up one weekend and demanding to have a 'delegate'?

» Or, as expected, are the 'delegates' to be hand-picked?

» Hand picked by whom and to what qualifications?

There seems to be one thing missing in the objectives and responsibilities of/for/by the NFCO/NFCC: What is it they really do? By this proposal, it is apparent that the majority of their combined function is to sit back, mail something to somebody and drink a lot of coffee. If this is true... hey, I

volunteer! I like coffee! And if I'm as busy as this proposal purports the 'delegates'

to be, drinking a lot of coffee will come in handy when all those stamps need 'moistening'!

I don't see a lot of justification for another 'special interest group' that will undoubtedly be staffed by 'special interest groups' whose main purpose is defined so loosely that the purpose appears to have disappeared. Is there really a need for another group of people with self-imposed titles to sit in a walnut lined office in an executives chair behind a hand-rubbed walnut desk financed with moneys purported to be for dues for another organization? Maybe that's the reason for the effort to change 47 USC 154! With a functional description such as illustrated in this proposal, it doesn't seem to me that they are going to have to do very much in the area of 'solving problems'. Looks like another avenue to spend more money and get nothing done. In other words, this appears to be a 'first draft' that needs to be classified 4F!

[Send EMail to Tom Blackwell](#)

Send snail mail to:
Tom Blackwell, N5GAR, P.O. Box 25403, Dallas, Texas 75225

[Go to PART 2](#)

[Go to the HOME Page](#)

